

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/627,018	07/27/2000	Helmut Weber	70442.1201 9975		
30734 75	590 09/15/2006		EXAMINER		
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP WASHINGTON SQUARE, SUITE 1100			THALER, MICHAEL H		
	CTICUT AVE. N.W.		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20036-5304		3731		
			DATE MAILED: 09/15/2000	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			SX			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	00			
Advisory Action	09/627,018	WEBER ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Michael Thaler	3731				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 25 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		•				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid abaidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth					
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY CONTROL OF THE FINAL REPLY CONTROL OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO W						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 3. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 1-7. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 8. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under apper y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	at does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement/s)	(PTO/SR/08) Paper No(s)					

Michael Thaler Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3731

13. Other: ____.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed cancelation of claim 8 would result in the reissue declaration becoming improper since the declaration is based upon the limitations of claim 8 as compared with the limitions of the other claims.